DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 055 IR 008 527

AUTHOR Best, John Hardin, Ed.: And Others
TITLE Symposium on a National Inventory of Historical Materials in American Education (University Park, Pennsylvania, June 14-15, 1979).
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE Jun 79
NOTE 54p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational History: *Guides: *Pilot Projects: Primary Sources: Program Development: *Reference Materials: *Resource Materials: *United States History

ABSTRACT

A 2-day symposium of historians and archivists prepared a series of 11 specific recommendations for the development of a comprehensive national inventory of historical materials in American education. A pilot project, recommended as the initial step, will focus on three aspects of education: community, formal, and higher education, possibly limited to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. A verbatim record of the proceedings is provided. (RAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED190055

SYMPOSIUM ON A NATIONAL INVENTORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

University Park, Pennsylvania
June 14-15, 1979

Edited by
John Hardin Best
Richard Alterman
with Peter A. Irvin

Division of Education Policy Studies
College of Education
The Pennsylvania State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John H. Best
Richard Alterman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR008527

APR 17 1980

Table of Contents

Preface V

Acknowledgements VII

Symposium Participants IX

Outline of Meetings XI

Overview 1

The Proceedings 4

- Research in Archives: Problems of Working with Historical Materials 7
- Developing an Inventory! Some Considerations 24
- Uses of Computers 28
- West German Project: An International Perspective 34
- General Discussion 36
- Symposium Review 47

Preface

From conversations with colleagues of many and varied interests over the years, the idea began to emerge that a national inventory of historical materials in education could make a significant contribution to research and study in history of education. The reasoning was that there exists a vast number of historical documents related to education in libraries and archives, as well as in attics and basements of schools and courthouses across the country. Knowledge of those materials was all too often held only by a local interested citizen, or archivist or school administrator of the community and by nobody else. A guide, it seemed, to the location, volume, type, content of these years of historical materials could inform researchers in new directions, open new dimensions for study in history of education.

These same discussions with colleagues, however, also raised a number of ponderous problems associated with conducting such an inventory, with current archive programs, and with the varied needs of scholars in the field. It was clear that we needed a "planning" conference to address these problems, to plan and develop strategies for a project that would be valuable in its product and at the same time feasible to do.

These proceedings are of the conference.

John Hardin Best

Richard Alterman

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No one engaged in a project of this type can fail to be aware of the many significant contributions which were made at various points of this enterprize. We first would like to express our gratitude to the Symposium participants for the valuable insights and suggestions they provided in the limited amount of hours allotted to discussion. We would also like to thank Dean Henry Hermanowicz, College of Education, The Pennsylvania State University, for his moral and financial support to hold the Symposium and publish the proceedings. Finally, we are deeply indebted to many colleagues who over the past two years have made crucial suggestions in the development of symposium issues as well as to the total effort. Those persons are as follows: Jo Ann Boydston, Geraldin Joncich Clifford, Sol Cohen, Lawrence Cremin, Barbara Finkelstein, Patricia Albjerg Graham, Ronald Goodenow, Frederick Rudolph, Gerald Tyson, and Wayne Urban.

SYMPOSIUM PARTICIPANTS

Gerald C. Eggert, Professor of American History, The Pennsylvania State University.

Ronald L. Filippelli, University Archivist, The Pennsylvania State University.

Hans Flexner, Associate Professor of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

Manfred Heinemann, Professor of General Education and Social History of Education, University of Hannover, West Germany.

Jurgen Herbst, Professor of Education Policy Studies, University of Wisconsin.

Andrea Hinding, Director, Walter Library, University of Minnesota.

Henry C. Johnson, Jr., Professor of Education Policy Studies, The Pennsylvania State University.

Paul Mattingly, Professor of History of Education, New York University.

Kathryn Moore, Associate Professor and Research Associate, Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

Nancy Sahli, Coordinator, Guide Program, National Historical Publications and Records Commission.

John B. Smith, Associate Professor of English, The Pennsylvania State University.

Donald R. Warren, Professor of Education Policy Studies, University of Maryland.

Richard Alterman, Assistant Professor of Education Policy Studies, The Pennsylvania State University.

John Hardin Best, Professor of Education Policy Studies, The Pennsylvania State University.

Peter Irvin, Graduate Assistant, Higher Education Program, The Pennsylvania State University.

SYMPOSIUM ON A NATIONAL INVENTORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

University Park, Pennsylvania, Nittany Lion Inn, June 14 and 15, 1979

OUTLINE OF MEETINGS

Thursday, June 14

1:30 p.m. - Welcome and Introduction, John Hardin Best

2:00 p.m. - Research in Archives: Problems of Working with Historical Materials
- Historian's View: Kay Moore; Paul Mattingly; Jurgen Herbst
- Archivist's View: Andrea Hinding; Ronald Filippelli

4:00 p.m. - Developing an Inventory: Some Considerations
Henry Johnson

6:30 p.m. - Dinner

Friday, June 15

9:00 a.m. - Uses of Computers
Nancy Sahli, John Smith

10:30 a.m. - West German Project: An International Perspective
Manfred Heinemann

11:45 a.m. - Lunch

1:30 p.m. - General Discussion

2:30 p.m. - Closing Remarks and Symposium Review
John Hardin Best

OVERVIEW

Historians and other scholars interested in the history of American education would agree that the development of a comprehensive inventory of documentary materials would promote the investigation of significant historical educational issues by greatly expanding the current available information on records, manuscripts, and collections. At present, guides to these materials are virtually non-existent. However, a wealth of historical documents are known to exist at numerous, non-publicized sites such as local archives, school buildings, county courthouses, private files, as well as in basements across the country. Knowledge related to the nature and extent of these materials is often known only to the immediate custodian or perhaps to the experts within a narrow field of study.

With present communication and computer capacity, it would seem that the means could be developed to disseminate information as to what exists, where, and in what extent, through a national inventory of historical education materials to better understand the problems and issues related to the compilation of the inventory, a two-day Symposium was convened at Pennsylvania State University on June 14, 1979. This conference brought together a varied group of historians, archivists and other scholars engaged in research and archival work in history and education. This document is a report of those proceedings.

At the meeting, participants were quick to agree on the project's value and potential impact on studies related to all aspects of American educational history. Kathryn Moore stated that the project was needed: to permit historians to better understand the nature of the "raw materials" with which they work; to enlighten students about the complexity of an historical judgement; and to help preserve and make use of the past. Paul Mattingly thought a guide to historical materials in college and university archives would be of tremendous value to scholars trying to understand the process of institutionalization modern society. He stated that current information as to what exists in college and university archives was insufficient to give rise to necessary comparative studies of higher education institutions.

Responses of conference participants to the project's potential problems were varied, significant and comprehensive. They served to provide project organizers with valued ideas associated with goals, methodology, focus, and feasibility. Ronald Filipelli and Andrea Hinding addressed problems of archives such as maintenance of adequate staff and physical space, low university priority and funding, as well as poor records management programs. Nancy Sahli, John Smith, and Henry Johnson commented on necessary considerations for computer involvement. Computer use, they suggested, was something to consider with caution in that great care must be taken in category design. Ms. Sahli's description of the effort of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission to develop a national guide of repositories helped participants better understand the potential use of computers in the development of subject guides to historical materials. Finally, Henry Johnson offered several concrete suggestions related to basic principles involved with the use and construction of categories.

At a following session Andrea Hinding described results of the recently completed survey of 11,000 repositories as to the extent of holdings related to women and women's history. She talked of problems associated with funding, estimation of costs, category design, survey response rate, use of field workers, printing and publication, number of entries and marketing. In addition, she suggested ways in which the women's history survey could be useful to a project focused on education.

Symposium members also heard Manfred Heinemann discuss his program to survey historical research projects in West Germany. His presentation offered an international perspective as well as valuable suggestions related to the use of computers as "intelligent" typewriters, use of bibliographies in historical research as entries, and publication of the guide and updating.

A central question raised at the Symposium was whether the initial inventory should perhaps be limited to an aspect of education such as higher education. It was suggested that this focus would provide the project with definition and thus make it more feasible and fundable. While this rationale held merit for many participants almost all agreed that a broad definition was necessary to provide more of a utilitarian value to the project.

For example, Jurgen Herbst pointed out that in the 19th century normal schools were associated with public schools and it was not until the 20th century that teacher education was considered a collegiate responsibility. In addition, Donald Warren stated that a limited focus would not help researchers understand "horizontal" relationships such as those found between educational associations, government, and institutions. Finally it was reasoned that a higher education project would not reveal inventory problems related to the educational activities offered in primary, secondary and community settings.

These important recognitions gave rise to a discussion concerned with dividing the total inventory effort into separate tasks, with each one to serve as a model or pilot project. Discussants reasonsed that perhaps the three pilot projects would, when joined together, provide the necessary strategies, focus, and methodology required to initiate a national inventory. To further the project's feasibility, it was also suggested that they should first focus on select institutions and efforts within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The published Symposium provided a number of recommendations and suggestions would have to be considered in any type of proposal to conduct an inventory of historical materials. The following list was synthesized from these proceedings.

1. The project should include a records management component to help insure that future documents will be preserved and that current items will be retained.

2. Any published guide to materials must have entries which are consistent with the standards of the Society of American Archivists as well as the

National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections.

3. The project should in part focus on materials found in non-repository settings.

4. Great care must be taken in the development of a survey instrument and in the design of categories since the subject of education can be so broadly interpreted.

5. The project must take into account the current space budget and staff problems which beset archives.

6. In category design, the current and future needs of historians must be taken into account.

7. An understanding of what documents are of historical value and which one should be included or discarded must be developed.

8. The efforts of the women's history survey and other similar projects can provide valuable insights and should be explored.

9. To better determine the magnitude of a national inventory, the initial effort should be a smaller, pilot project.

10. The initial stage of a national inventory could be to establish three pilot efforts focusing on three aspects of education: community; formal; and higher education.

11. It is not necessary to rush into the use of computers.

These recommendations made clear to program organizers the necessity for carefully developed proposals for this project. While at times the criticisms, suggestions, and considerations were overwhelming and produced a feeling near bewilderment, in general they were seen as very constructive. They served to reveal the difficulty and complexity of the task and they provided vital strategies to accomplish it. Conference organizers were encouraged by expressed enthusiasm for both the need and feasibility of a national inventory and saw that an effort such as this would indeed be a significant challenge.

THE PROCEEDINGS

Introductory Statement

Best:

First I welcome you all to the campus of The Pennsylvania State University and I thank you for your interest in the work of this conference. At the start perhaps I should underline a few points. The intent of this meeting as you know is to explore the problems associated with developing a national inventory of historical materials in education. We are interested in the questions of need and possible uses of such a project, as well as of course the question of feasibility. Is it indeed possible to accomplish this grand design we have in mind? The more I talk to all of you the more I realize how extensive this effort could be, how really mammoth the problems might be. At any rate what I would like to see us do is an exploration of "how bad is it?" I think the statement "Description of Project" which you have in hand should provide an outline of some specific problems and questions as a basis for beginning discussion. So, let us proceed.

(Following is the "Description of Project" which was distributed prior to the meeting of the Symposium.)

A SYMPOSIUM ON A NATIONAL INVENTORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

Description of Project

The Symposium will bring together a varied group of scholars, persons engaged in research and archival work in history and education, to examine issues and problems concerning a national inventory of archives and historical materials in American education. The plan of such an inventory briefly stated is the compilation of a guide to these documentary materials. Collections of historical documents exist at numerous sites in libraries and archives across the country, but frequently the nature and the extent of these materials is known only to the local archivist or perhaps to the experts within a narrow field of study. With today's capabilities for communications, duplication and computerization, it would seem that the means could be developed to disseminate information as to what exists, where, and in what extent, through a national inventory of existing collections of materials. Such an inventory would form the basis of a data bank which would then be an important aid to students, scholars, to any interested persons in exploring the educational past.

The development of a comprehensive inventory of documentary materials should promote the investigation of significant historical educational issues by greatly expanding the current available information on collections. Archival guides to educational materials are virtually non-existent in the field, hence students and scholars find the task of making a thorough investigation of manuscript materials a heavily time consuming one. And thoroughness indeed becomes increasingly burdensome year by year. The increased involvement for example of the federal government in the role of schooling has intensified the need to develop a system to investigate the broadest possible aspects of any issue. A study

concerned with the development of a state reading program would hardly be complete without an examination of federal agencies participation in such a program. The cross-indexing capabilities that would be provided in a national inventory of archive materials would permit scholars to examine this relationship and perhaps provide suggestions for contrasting or additional studies. There could be problems in such a plan, of course, questions of usefulness and need, as well as problems of feasibility in implementation and design. These questions and problems are the focus of the proposed symposium.

A two day meeting to be held in June, 1979, on the campus of The Pennsylvania State University will explore specific questions on the need for such an inventory and the feasibility of accomplishing the task. Each symposium participant will review the set of questions posed in this document and come prepared for full discussion of the questions at the meeting. The expectation is that the discussion and analysis of the issues by this diverse group of scholars will offer a perspective of the current state of archives and documentary materials in the history of education in the United States, as well as illuminate the problems that might be encountered in the effort to do a national inventory of archival and historical materials in education. Following the meeting the Coordinator will compile and edit the proceedings of the symposium for publication and distribution to interested persons in the scholarly community.

The issues to be addressed by the symposium participants fall into two general areas. First are questions of need and usefulness:

1. What extent and degree of coverage of materials in a national inventory should be projected in order to attain maximum effective use? Illustrate citations in several areas as examples of the kind and depth of information to be included.

2. What are the possible uses of a national inventory, for researchers in what fields of study, for library reference purposes, for broad individual citizen use? Illustrate possible uses in several areas, such as for scholars and students in family history, or post-secondary education.

3. What record of use has developed in existing comparable bibliographic guides or data banks? Examine the organization of the varied NHPRC projects, the Women's History project, and others.

Second are questions of feasibility and design:

1. What are the categories that should be included in organizing the inventory, a taxonomy of the field? Examine feasibility of a three stage organization: (1) higher education, (2) schools and schooling, and (3) community and non-formal education.

2. What are the problems in developing a data bank for this field, an effective computerized retrieval system? Illustrate problems in programming data in this area and possible solutions.

3. What search strategies are possible for obtaining most efficiently the necessary information from libraries and collections in all fifty states? Illustrate with examples the kinds of information to be obtained from libraries and collections, through mail inquiry and through on site examination. Estimate time and labor required for gathering on site information.

4. How can the broadest possible accessibility to the inventory be developed? Indicate a possible organization, with areas of information to be included, for a published guide to use of the data bank. Suggest other strategies, the use of meetings of professional organizations, journals and other publications, for expanding accessibility.

5. What are possible ways and means for establishing continuing long term operation of the inventory as a service to scholars, libraries and agencies over many years? Explore the possibility of establishing at a university or other institution a center to do the work of the initial inventory and to expand continually the bank of data, as well as to maintain the bank as a service to the public and the scholarly community.

Responsible for organizing and coordinating the symposium is John Hardin Best, The Pennsylvania State University. The consultant for the project is Richard Alterman, the Florida State Department of Higher Education.

The product of the symposium will be in the clarification of the issues surrounding the possible development of a national inventory of archives and documentary materials in the history of education. It is an opportunity to explore the problems as well as the possibilities of such an enterprise. Scholars in history and education in all the diverse areas of those fields, through the dissemination of the symposium proceedings, will be afforded the opportunity to criticize, to judge, to offer suggestions and ideas on the national inventory plan. The symposium will open discussion on this plan which would have considerable significance to study in these fields.

RESEARCH IN ARCHIVES: PROBLEMS OF WORKING WITH HISTORICAL MATERIALS

Historians

Moore:

I would like to focus my remarks on the problems that beset someone who is a part-time historian of higher education--someone who by needs of other job responsibilities dips in and out of the history of higher education, rather than someone working continually in historical materials. To give us a flavor of that, I chose some words from Saul Sack, who wrote **The History of Higher Education in Pennsylvania** in 1963, words which tell us what he went through in order to write that history.

> "The search for documents was frequently exacting and exciting. Records were often found in the most unlikely places--attics, subcellars, abandoned safes, bottom drawers of filing cabinets, prescription rooms of apothecaries, and the interstices of desks whose owners had long forgotten their contents were repositories of materials that served to give substance to institutions whose claims to existence lay in charters recorded in the impersonal records of law. It is to be regretted that some past custodians of college archives were lax in discharging their trust. They were often unaware of or indifferent to the importance of the documents they held. A dean of women proudly reported that she had deliberately destroyed materials which in her judgment painted some of the past presidents of her institution in an unfavorable light. A few of the State colleges and universities either lost or misplaced such vital records as the minutes of trustees meetings and faculty senate meetings. The future recorders of their histories will have to depend upon the uncertain memory of aged alumni and the incomplete records of the local press."

That summarizes very poignantly the problem of the working historian, and of ourselves. In any given topic the historian is dealing with the need to find all the relevant materials, some of which can only be judged relevant upon their examination. You cannot make the judgment before you are sure that you have gotten the materials at hand. A second concern is that materials essential to the topic, or to its full elaboration, are lost. This may mean that they have been destroyed by accident or quite deliberately. That they are misplaced. That they are misplaced around a county or are not in the place that you would look for them. That they are inaccessible in some way. For example, papers of presidents will not be released, in some cases, though you would not know that until you asked. Or, they are unknown, and if the historian does not know of the existence of a document of a set of documents, it cannot be used. It is as lost as if it were unknown to the historian, as if it were destroyed. A reference or a source by which the historian can peruse all the possible relevant sources and trace them down is not at hand at this point and to have one is essential to the development of historical work, in my judgment.

I think that the quotation from Saul Sack is evocative of how education is, in another way, woven into the whole fabric of our society. The Bailyn thesis is quite commonplace to any historian who tries to track down historical material for a piece on education, because the thread immediately leaves the educational topic and trails out into the society and into the common life of people. In a sense, Beach's effort, in 1975, to build a bibliography that focused on institutions such as colleges and universities, was defeated before it began because he found that he could not stick solely to official histories of institutions. He had to move to individuals who were important to that institution and then to constituencies and to relationships that surrounded that institution. He did this because the institution is always in a "context," and those become relevant to any historical discussion. If we are to consider the needs of historians who are working with materials, we need also to consider whether or not we have at hand the raw materials, the documents in the archives, the materials that a researcher needs.

Another aspect is the historian as a teacher. One of the best ways to illustrate the complexity and diversity of your topic is to have someone peruse an archive and try to track down a topic of research. Have them first start with the published material, then proceed to the primary material. This would serve to enlighten students about the complexity of how an historical judgment is made, and the basis on which one would feel free to make that kind of judgment.

Finally, as a public servant, I think the historian needs to illustrate to the rest of the society the relevance of his or her work in terms of describing its past and in terms of preserving that past. There is a significant concern for preservation and for active use of the past. I think a collection of the sort we are beginning to discuss would play an important role in this, and I am hopeful that our discussion will lead to the development of a project which will link late 20th century technology to the preservation of pre-1980s materials.

Mattingly:

With the Center for the Study of Higher Education being here at Penn State, I thought the main propensity at this symposium should be for higher education and I support this for a number of reasons. First of all, the Center probably has a significant archive collection concerned with any problems in the educational field, but higher education has come to be something more than just higher education. It is one of the primary institutions of our culture, and if we understand its 20th century character, which you can only understand by understanding what has gone before, it seems that we will know something about central issues which require clarification that we do not now have. If we consider our culture, one of the distinctive features of the 20th century is that our values and routines are institutionally defined in ways that are unprecedented, that did not exist in the 19th century. The whole process of institutionalization will have light shed on it by one of the more defined institutions, higher education. We ought to recognize that a number of things that we need to articulate now would come from a collection of archives on higher education. The issue of institutionalization and the problems that stem from it ought to be foremost and broadly cast though we could begin modestly and reasonably by looking at institutions of higher education.

I think the major impediment to our understanding of institutionalization is that we are so familiar with it. It is so much a part of our culture that we no longer have the perspectives or even the language for understanding how new the impact of institutions really is. Institutional experience is so novel that we are still using turn-of-the-century language for getting at it. That is a real problem, but one of the better ways to attack that problem is through a comparative analysis. It is virtually impossible however with the current archival situations. For example, Thomas Bassett, at The University of Vermont, has tried to assemble a complete collection of college catalogs for 19th and 20th century institutions of higher education, and he cannot do it. He cannot find them. He is asking for something very modest, not primary archives. He is asking for old printed materials that in some cases he would be willing to duplicate. The comparative analysis, though, is one of the major strategems for getting at the overall problems of institutionalization, and you cannot do it without an archive such as the one proposed here.

Until now the study of institutions has generally been done by a long-term member of the faculty or by an individual with various kinds of defensive values or celebrationist values about the institution itself. It is generally written for a centennial or sesquicentennial and has the up-beat flavor of those events. If they go beyond that, and a number of stellar institutional histories do, they break it down by centering attention on charismatic individuals, presidents, dynamic professors--single individuals. Or, they do it by the policy making statements of the presidents themselves, which do not take into account the impact of those policies if they had any; policies do not always coincide with reality.

Recent scholarship has paid some attention to the problem of impact and has tried to focus attention on students, the group clienteles that were affected by specific policies. However, archives do not exist to take that study very far. Archivists with whom I have worked, in general have no liaisons with alumni associations, and yet one would think this would be a natural source to collect information on the alumni for collective biographies, career line analyses, things which really tell about institutional policy. Frequently, when alumni associations want to do a directory, it is essentially a telephone book. The only college directories I know that should serve the historian as well as the alumni are those put out by institutions such as Bowdoin and Amherst Colleges where the alumni associations work with the archivist. In general however, this does not happen. Without information on students, much is lost. This is beyond just a problem of documents.

Adding to Saul Sack's list, a number of presidents of institutions, not historians themselves, have a sense of responsibility about the past. For one reason or another, all of the presidential archives at which I have looked contain something very significant for archives institution's. There are valuable documents that we cannot afford to let burn if there is a fire, like the existing budget figures. I have found things in presidential safes. In part this highlights a very serious problem about archival collection and that is that many of the key documents do not lodge in the libraries or the archives themselves, nor do the librarians or the archivists know where they are. At one particular institution I found

an old alumnus who actually did remember where the archives were that I needed. They were not in the library; they were in the safe of the alumni association, a place which should be added to the list. To show you how quirkish this is, I am reminded of a colleague who hunted for documents which he knew to exist. The archivist he consulted told him they did not exist. He had been archivist there for twenty years and he knew the archives backward and forward. The documents did however exist. My colleague asked if he could take a look. Cordially, but somewhat hesitantly, the archivist consented. He was there five minutes before he found what he knew was there and this was because he is 6'3" and the archivist was 5 foot, something. He just turned left and there they were, the old leather-bound volumes on the highest shelf that the archivists had never taken down. So sometimes in archives there are problems like this where key documents are not known to even the archivist. I think it is also a problem for the profession of archivists itself.

When documents are located and you finally find them in those bottom drawers and apothecary shops, there are serious problems of access and permissible use, which should be very much on our mind. There are deep presidential and dean files, and the problem and issue of privacy has also to be in our mind particularly in light of the Buckley Amendment.

There is also the insidious issue of indifference. I know that the Children's Aid Society in New York City, is a very important institution to study to understand the role of the family and child rearing and has a space problem. The existing director, not an historian, has some sense of responsibility to the past, and some sense of responsibility to his space problems. He has thick dossiers on children in the 19th century, which followed children from age 2-3-4 till their deaths. They are very long and is a type of historical data which exists nowhere else. To solve his space problem he saves every fourth dossier. It hurts the historians when this happens. He did not even think about the New York Historical Society. He just eliminated them with the best of intentions.

It is also difficult to coordinate archives that exist. I do not have answers for this, but have tried to lay out some of the problems from the researcher's point of view.

The problem of the historian, and the archivist, is that it is difficult to foretell what will be needed. Everything is evidence for something. Often decisions have to be made ahead of time and that becomes very difficult. We ought to recognize that problem as a given dilemma of this whole effort.

I would like to mention a couple of other pertinent things. First we may have set our sights low by turning to government and the obvious foundation sources for money for funding such a project. In part, our effort is to make the case for need, but the need is more than just for preservation. If we believe that history is connected to present policies, it seems that there really is a place for an analysis of institutions of all sorts, not just colleges. A case could be made for an historical analysis that is on a par with any kind of economic analysis, economic projection, budget critique.

There is a role for historical analysis amidst current institutional evaluation, and current institutional planning, that most members of the history profession have not yet considered. There is one recently formed organization whose prime purpose is to act as an historical consultant to precisely these institutions. It is called The Potomac Educational Resources Incorporated, Washington, DC. This suggests that there is a market that could be tapped for a project like this. A case could be made to begin with institutions of higher education, that they do need to know their history in ways in which the centennial histories have never entertained.

Let me conclude by offering some concrete examples that we might use to demonstrate the significance of a guide to archival materials that might permit certain kinds of comparative work. First, you might make the case for a wholly different kind of related institution that is significant for our time and which is in general not often mentioned for study. These are umbrella councils and the professional associations, institutions which we think of as in the voluntary sector but are no longer voluntary in the 19th century sense. They are phenomenally important though their authority is indirect. They are important to understand how policy-making comes about in our own time. In fact, one might argue that these institutions themselves are the essential lubricant that drives the bureaucracy. It seems to me some of these umbrella councils, such as the National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Council of Education, and a host of others are institutions whose histories are affected by this type of project. Sociologists call these institutions mediating institutions. An archive such as we propose here is very important, and when we talk about the significance of this project we ought to be a little bit more ambitious and bolder. I know you want to start modestly, but I think that already the significance is well beyond the specific institutions whose archives are recorded here.

Herbst:

I think we should by no means, even though it is a first step, just restrict ourselves to higher education. The comparative theme which Dr. Mattingly raised is very high on my list of priorities, however it could be performed in different ways. It depends, for example, on how you look at higher education institutions in the 19th century. They certainly were part of the common school system, and people who begin work in that area would probably make the association that normal schools, teacher education institutions, belong in the category: public schools. On the other hand, if somebody from the 20th century studies where teacher education is presently accomplished, he would almost immediately classify it as higher education. Neither of these, of course, is wrong, but it is a matter of perspective and of approach. These matters of perspective and of approach present some problems to us in how to organize, how to classify the types of materials with which we would like to work. It takes very intensive thought to straighten this out in our minds.

In addition there is the comparison both in the states in this country and in an international way. I think of Dr. Heinemann's work in administration of secondary education, a subject where many topics would ring here as though we were talking about 19th century colleges, because these institutions in an inter-

national sense are not on the same comparable level. One has to make allowances for that and take that into account, particularly since it is not just in this country that we are concerned with archive classification. With some of the work that I understand is done and sponsored through UNESCO, inevitably the question comes up about doing all this so that it could be used on a far wider scale than we might think of as we begin. We have to have this, if not in the front, at least in the back of our minds at the beginning in order not to block ourselves from such developments later on.

Another point is that after having worked for a good many years in university archives, I have become very fond of archivists and have found a tremendous amount of support. By the same token what has impressed me is the great variety, diversity, and dissimilarity of archives. Let me put it the other way, I think it would help us as researchers if archives across the country were organized in the same manner. If we as historians now want to approach archivists and would like them to help us prepare such an inventory, should we ask them in the sense of "What do you have?" "Give us a list of what you have; write down what you have." Another possibility would be that both historians and archivists should agree beforehand upon a more or less uniform scheme which would make comparability more possible. If you drew up a list for what a university archive must have and it would have questions like–"Do you have trustee minutes? Do you have faculty minutes? Do you have correspondence of alumni?" If you did that, archival content might be organized in a certain way. On the other hand, the real issue when I worked in the University of Vermont archives was whether they had materials that related to the university's relationship to Middlebury College, to the Vermont Legislature, to Dartmouth College, to Harvard College, to the Congregational Churches, et cetera. If you use that approach it would be vastly different from the first one. I am not prepared to tell you that one is better than the other, but I see it as a problem, and we have to give this some thought. What is the most feasible way, the most useful way to organizing this kind of effort? What pattern ought we to follow?

Finally, let me add a thought that has come to me mainly through, shall we say, tales of woe of my students. As people who have spent at least some years in professional pursuits, we take a great many things for granted and expect everybody to know as much as we do. Well, we mean for these inventories to be useful, not only to specialists but to graduate students, undergraduates, and, I think it was said, the general public. We have to make this more open than we might think would be necessary for ourselves. That consideration does not come easily to us, because by habit we think in our own terms. If we want this to be useful in a much wider way, that has implications, to which I think we should give some thought.

Archivists

Filippelli:

I have a list of things, as an archivist who is also an historian. Frequently and increasingly in major institutions, archivists are historians or have advanced degrees, usually in the humanities or social sciences in some area. They are not totally unfamiliar with research in this area. In regard to what is kept and to what is thrown away, everything is of interest to someone. Archives have terrific space

problems and problems of minimal staff level. We are not a high priority item in university budgets. It is simply not possible because of this to keep everything. To use an example from labor history, we were not terribly concerned, even ten years ago, with membership lists or dues lists. We had other kinds of records with which we were much more concerned. We did not throw those dues lists away, but we did not take a lot of time worrying about them. Today, of course, they are "hot" items in terms of social history, family history, geneology, ethnic and immigration history, women's history, et cetera, because they list a person's name, frequently their address, important for all kinds of new approaches to history. It is not possible for archivists to foresee what will be required and decisions must be made on what to keep and what to discard. Miniaturization is one solution to this, but filming is expensive. Another point is that under the best circumstances, we collect only a tiny amount of any kind of educational or institutional material that is generated.

Hinding:

The rule of thumb being given nationally is that in the 20th century we will be lucky to be able to afford to save 5 percent of the records--paper and other--that are generated. So archivists' major professional problem in the next so many years is to decide what to throw away. Everybody is interested in something. So we just have a problem of the first order in appraisal.

Filippelli:

On the issue of who should decide what is kept and what is discarded, I am not sure that historians would be any better at making that kind of a prediction than the general run of archivists, whether or not they are historians themselves. A point to remember also is that what has been said here about educational history applies to every kind of history in every area of study, in regard to what is saved what is not saved. This is not true just of educational institutions. It is true of political history; it is true of labor history, it is true of business history. These are problems common to almost all historical research, and that is changing. Presently, we are getting the so-called interest in history from the bottom-up, rank and file history, immigrant history, ethnic history, and that is posing new problems for archivists. A tremendous amount of this kind of information already resides in archives, whatever the subject, but archivists arranging materials twenty years ago or thirty years ago were not arranging them for researchers who were going to come in and try to find out this kind of information. And, you cannot rearrange archives. If archives have 50 percent of their holdings arranged at even a preliminary level they are lucky. The idea that somehow they are going to get them all arranged at some point and that they can respond to these changing demands in archival arrangement is naive. They are not going to be able to do it. This is particularly so, with modern records which are so voluminous, and of which archivists under the best circumstances can give you only superficial descriptions. The scholar has to do the work.

You are probably right when you say that the archivist does not know what he has. We have thousands of feet of records right across the campus here; we collect millions of institutional records. If you ask me whether we have a particular thing on the steelworkers, I am going to say, "I'm sorry, we have the

records of the educational department of the steelworkers for those years, go look." I am going to give you a file folder heading which unfortunately is very imprecise. That is the best that we can do, since we are talking about several hundred cartons of material. We are thrilled that we can give you that. Chances are that you are not going to be able to get any more than that.

Archivists frequently have no liaison with alumni, and archivists frequently have no liaison with university administration. Archivists are "small fry" in the university setting. Part of the problem is that scholars in other departments and faculty members are the ones in the university who think the university exists for them. They give very little support to archivists. Salaries for archivists are low, archivist staffing levels are low, and archival space is low. Materials are frequently stored in basements and various places in universities while faculty members have rather comfortable offices. Archives generally are not air conditioned. Archivists in the present climate in higher education are just holding on with undergraduate work-study students doing much of the processing.

One final point about this, which follows the whole question of the amount of material and the ability of archivists to deal with it, is the principle of "provenance." This is that if records come in a certain arrangement, the archivists do not tamper with it because, theoretically, that indicates the way the institution operated or the individual saw his or hew own records or whatever, and therefore it is useful to the scholar to see that arrangement to understand something about the institution. I think that is sound reasoning. It means, however, that it is difficult to respond to all these changing needs.

Hinding:

I think that historical training is indispensible for archivists. If we create a generation of archivists with just library science degrees, we are all in a lot of trouble because it is a technical versus a substantive degree. It is very useful that, increasingly, archivists and historians are synonymous. What we should all pray for is an archival profession that takes a more systematic approach to the problem of documentation and is less likely to be bullied by current research interests. This may irritate current researchers, but I think in the end the problem of finding out what you want in an archive is best solved in that fashion.

Mattingly:

To strengthen the perspective, the National Endowment for the Humanities funded New York University's history department to develop an archives training program that has functioned now for three years. The bulk of those people are not going into academic institutions at all; they are going into archives in banks, in industry, in places where historians may not have been aware there were archives. Many of the businesses, particularly in New York where they have their central offices, not only want their archives, but they want archivists with historical backgrounds, and they are not just using one of their existing staff members part-time. This underscores the point that there are markets out there who will pay for what you are planning to create as a base; I think that the NYU program in archival training bears this out. The people who are serious about preserving their archives are people who want to control their own histories and they are

very serious about getting professional staffers to do it. A project such as this could help archivists with their present problems.

Hinding:

Many historians and archivists have been remnants people. Your research is based on what you find in repositories with no notion of whether or not the remnant is representative of the experience or the phenomenon. I think we are in a period of transition where groups, like the scholars and the archivists, can start to think about documentation--about how we insure that things we are gathering are representative and document adequately our institutions. The point about college and university archives is a fine one. At Minnesota, we have one of the largest and one of the finest, I think, in the country. It documents the institution itself. There is no way to get at student experience. There is no way to document what research is and how it is different in the Institute of Technology, in the College of Liberal Arts, and in Health Sciences. To achieve this means to come to terms with the following: What is a university? To what extent do the paper records or other records document what goes on? If the paper records do not, how do we go out in the institution and create our own records to be sure that something is left for the future?

Eggert:

When, as an historian, I do historical research and find inadequate records, I wonder what is being done for my successors with the records that we have today. I wonder if an approach might be not to worry so much about the 19th and 18th and earlier century documents. We might do well to consider what materials ought we to be saving presently; to be talking about getting institutions themselves to systematically save their records and put them in archives. Ought we to talk about framing legislation to see that certain documents are preserved and maintained, because if we worry too much about the 19th century material, tons of 20th century material will get away from us? Another concern is that there are new forms of material which historians have never before utilized, such as tape recordings, moving pictures, and TV videos. I would not know how to go about training a student, for example, to evaluate what the expression on a president's face means when he says something. We used to just go by what they said. It may be nothing, but you have to be aware that these are things that we have never before encountered.

Filippelli:

Most of the 18th century records and 19th century records which now rest in American repositories were collected in the 20th century. They survived through trials and tribulations and they are remnants, we got to them a hundred years later, and we got them in institutions. The records that you are talking about now, the new kind of record, will not even exist, the tape recording will not last that long, we have to collect it now. The amount of material is the critical problem. Eighteenth and 19th century records did not pose space problems for their holders in the way that modern records do. Imagine computer print-outs for example. Institutions are keeping these records for three and four years and if there are statutory regulations, they have to keep certain material for a number of years. Otherwise, they throw the records out because of enormous space problems.

Hinding:

A related problem is that the 19th century records and colonial records sat around in basements and attics on high quality rag paper. However more recent materials, because of the lower quality of paper, do not have a life expectancy of thirty years. Once we have decided what to save, then we have to convert it into some form to insure the information content is preserved.

Eggert:

I read about the burning of the great library at Alexandria, and I think, well, maybe it did save a lot. As historians we have to accept the fact that not everything is going to be saved, but I would like to think that in the 20th century we could be a little more systematic. It does require tackling the nastiest problem first, which is, where are you going to store all this stuff?

Sahli:

At the Commission we can see a certain need for the development of "a program" for the whole country. It is going to be difficult to decide what should be saved, how we should save it, and where to get the money to do it. If we had $10 million and a couple of years, we might come to some decisions, but I think we are always faced with the money question, and while we can talk in very neat, philosophical terms about what should be done, the money is simply not there. We are not particularly cost effective from the point of view of what we can do for the finances of the institution. How does Penn State, for example, see the archives in a records management setting?

Filippelli:

Penn State has no university archives in the sense of Minnesota, Cornell, or some of the better known archives. There is a records management program at the University and we have made appeals to the University over the years to fund it, to set up the university archives, to really systematize it, but there simply is not much interest, particularly in the present economic climate. Thus we make independent contacts with all the colleges and departments like little independent fiefdoms. For example, if we can talk the Political Science Department into saving us their records, if they happen to have them, that is fine. So we end up with the Political Science Department's records or with the Chemistry Department's records and we have a little odd collection of records, just like you have if you collect any institution's records. We have the steelworker's papers, theoretically. That is a million and a half member union. Literally thousands of local unions. We have a scattering of materials from local unions, a scattering of districts, and we have a lot of the international unions' records. This is because they are easier to collect.

This project would help since it would heighten the awareness of the situation and it probably could be used to show what other places are doing or where we are lagging behind. I think it would be equally useful to work through associations, some of the professional associations. to develop policies for their member institutions to encourage this kind of thing, to get literature out and at professional meetings to raise this issue. If associations such as the American Association of Colleges and Universities would take an active interest in this at their meetings,

encourage this type of activity, then we might generate support when we approach our own institutions.

Eggert:

Do we have any good collections that could be used as models when we talk to college presidents and their association?

Filippelli:

I think there are. Sure.

Hinding:

A long-range solution is that this society has to value projects such as this more than it does now, because records serve all of us in various ways. It is less important that archivists' rooms are not air conditioned, but it is dreadful that the records are not air conditioned. It takes scholarly groups, it takes organizations and institutions to begin to have an awareness of records before there is some kind of shift in the national consciousness. My sense is that the Canadian and British systems work more rationally. They value this type of activity more. We are in a society in which we have been suspicious of or apathetic toward records. The real solution to our problems, the labor historians' problems and women's historians problems, is for there to be some sort of massive shift. I do not know how that miracle can be worked, but we can begin.

Sahli:

It seems to be occurring in little pocket areas. You are probably familiar with what has been going on with architectural records recently. To some degree I think a lot of the professional and business groups in this country have not been too interested in retaining their records because they do not want future generations to know what they were doing. As in the case of architects, as somebody at the AIA said, they are more interested in the design of new buildings and seeing the building as the only record that needs to be kept rather than retaining records of past projects. With the present interest now on historic preservation, the archivists with the help of architects are getting more into architectural records. You need to interest more groups in the importance of historical records, for legal reasons if nothing else. If you are involved in a lawsuit, for example, you would need to have your historical records to successfully litigate. Some of the most interesting current projects relate to legal records and have the backing of the legal profession and the judges. The architectural projects have been receiving the backing of architects. The constituency for education is so large that you could develop the same kind of interest among educators or anyone who has been involved with an institution of higher learning in this country.

Mattingly:

In this culture you are going to have to dramatize the seriousness of an historical record in a way that you do not otherwise. The way most archives are organized arises because someone writes a history of the institution and does some organizing to get those archives in order. We ought to take some of our cues from that, pick up a few strategic institutions and write their histories and dramatize what might be done.

Smith:

I wonder what possible orders of magnitude might be involved in the project. Are we, in fact, talking about a global effort to essentially restructure the whole process of archiving or are we talking about a more limited set of goals?

Hinding:

The experience of the women's history sources survey is pertinent to that. When we began, we were approached in various ways with the exact list of things that has been mentioned here--a center in an institution of higher education, a data bank, an archival survey, gathering of information to use in current planning, the whole universe of records that at one time we had an offer to have all the girls scouts in the country to go out and find. What we did was survey repositories for the material in them. We are now just finishing. A week ago we sent 19,000 index cards to our publisher in New York. When the work is finally published, for women's history at least, some of these other problems of data banks, computerization, will sort themselves out. By going out and saying to archivists and manuscripts curators "what have you got?", we got such an incredible response that it started to sort out priorities for us, and I think it will for the history profession. The project started in February of 1975 when we received a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to survey all the archives and manuscript repositories in the United States asking them about collections of material pertaining to the history of women in America from the colonial period to the present.

We spent months writing questionnaires and putting them on pretty and different colored paper, because there is a problem in getting people's attention. We worked for months over definitions and common terms. We could not get archivists to agree on what a collection is, what is this and that. And then, we have a problem not unlike yours, in a sense almost everything is women, almost everything is education. It is all a seamless web. The first grant proposal envisioned a fifteen month project with myself, one full-time editor, one full-time secretary and a half-time graduate student, for about $60,000. To this date, we have received outright from NEH, $500,000, and that does not count the university's real and paper contributions. It does not count the money being invested in publishing and by the publisher or anything else. So we turned out with something like a three-quarter million dollar project and a cast of literally thousands including archivists. We had not really thought about what we might find, but we envisioned a nice little volume to have on your desk--sell it for about $30 or whatever. We also did not know what universe we had because we did not have the NHPRC directory, but we went around and asked archivists in the country, how many repositories there were. No one knew. The best guess was of 5,000. In order to hedge against inflation and oversight, we upped the number and pretended there were 6,000 historical agencies in the country. In fact, we ended with a mailing list of 11,000 potential repositories. There are 11, or 12,000 entities out there that range from institutions as sophisticated as the Library of Congress to county historical societies that are open some days during the summer months and staffed by part-time people. But they are all custodians of records. We managed to get 7,000 of these entities to respond to us. By the time we were done with the project, 1,600 repositories had reported to us 18,000 plus collections

or archives and manuscript material that bore on women. There might be at least that many that pertain to education. There might even be that many that would bear in some way just on higher education, much less schools and schooling.

The text of the book was 10,000 manuscript pages. It will turn out to be 1,700 pages of 7-point type. It will have a 900 page index. Before coming to this symposium, I looked at some of the index entries under "education," "schools" and "schooling." Under a general entry for college teachers alone, we turned up 500 collections of records, and a collection may range from a couple of volumes of a diary or journal to literally 18,000 linear feet of records held by the National Archives. There are 500 general entries under college teachers; schools and schooling, I stopped counting at 300! There are also entries for literally hundreds of colleges, universities, normal schools, and schools. I think the success of this project, and the cooperation of archivists in it, suggest that a similar project could be funded. It might be very interesting to fund another subject survey, to see what happens when you go back to archivists and ask them about education, and how do they respond to that question, no matter how you refine the question, as opposed to the way they responded to the question about women's history sources.

Discussion

Eggert:

Is that project computerized or are you going to have to do this all over again in five years?

Hinding:

When we started we were besieged by people who wanted to put us into their data bank, who wanted us to automate right away. We looked at costs, and we looked around at the technology, and thought we will do it the hard way. This was five years ago; now, the publisher has all the data in his computer-it is being published, printed, set by a computer and we can go back to individual entries and refine them. I have to identify myself as not a skeptic about computers, but my first instinct is not to be sure a computer can do it. My first instinct is to understand the problem and do it, and leave possibilities open. We did talk about what we were doing with our local computer people and when they found out that we were talking about 40 million characters, they just threw up their hands and went away. That is not to say it should not be automated, but by asking the simple question and doing the simple thing first, we have now produced something that becomes a basis to argue for refinements of it in terms of computerization, subsequent studies, models for collection, development.

Sahli:

I agree wholeheartedly that one should not rush into computers at the beginning. From our experience in using Spindex, which is a particular computer system, and looking at other people's systems, the worst thing that we could have done with our data base was to rush in and get an on-line system. You really have to look ahead and estimate where this project is going to be in fifty years. If all we have now is soft money that will expire in three years, is there really any

future for this project? Is this going to be a short-term project with short-term goals, or is this going to be a long-term project that has some ready funding, hard money not soft money, that will enable it to go on year after year? If we look at the universe of public records, or organizational records, we are talking maybe 30,-40,000 different institutional entities. If you described each collection, each record group within those, forget about a book publication right away. I think you are really going to have to take a hard look at some of these questions.

Hinding:

The NHPRC directory advances administrative control over what we got by identifying repositories, their nature and their collecting scope, their hours, their services, their photocopying resources, et cetera. I think it is probably the most important thing that has happened in the archives field because it moves us toward understanding at least where the repositories are located. The women's history sources survey moves into the area of intellectual control. It gets down to collections and what is in them. That is a distinction to bear in mind. It would be one thing to get administrative control over close to 100,000 entities, but the other is to get into the records themselves and say what is there.

Sahli:

I would agree and I think the approach that you can take in doing those two types of surveys is very different. Another point to consider is that if you want to influence policy and future decision making, it may be better to get a general, universal look, rather than to focus in too closely at the outset.

Archivists frequently deal with hierarchies. You start, for example, with a hierarchy the top layer of which is the international level, the second layer is the national level, the third layer is the state, the fourth is the local, and the fifth is the individual. Within that hierarchy you may have different informational hierarchies. If we are talking about archives and manuscript repositories our directory is at the top level--general information about an institution. The National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections is probably at the second level where you have complete collection descriptions regardless of subject. At a third level, still in the collection category, you have specialized subject analysis. You might do much more detailed analysis, different permutations within the women's history field. You might do college women, narrow things down even farther. The deeper you go into the hierarchy, the more complex it becomes and you will find the information you need to do your survey less readily available. As you move down from the top hierarchy where a mail survey might work, it becomes necessary to start thinking in terms of field workers, of access to the materials. The rate of return if you are doing a mail survey is very small.

Smith:

To pick up on that point, a formal survey of archival materials would be useful but a major factor that has to be taken into consideration is that many materials are not collected in formal archives or formal collections. Within a single institution such as Penn State or the University of Minnesota, they may be scattered in 50 or 100 different offices of different locations. One of the things that we have to do if this project is going to move anywhere is to develop a very

formal taxonomy that identifies materials, but I doubt that it can be done deductively. We would probably dead with archivists through questionnaires, but one of the points we made earlier was that only a fraction of materials is in archives. A taxonomy would guide our approach to cataloging materials. This project is not talking about acquiring materials, but simply acquiring a description of a collection of materials.

Eggert:

It still goes back to the issue of whether the material listed is going to be there later. Unless you are talking about getting the materials into a place where it will be safe, there is no certainty that it will exist after your list is drawn up.

Hinding:

In the words of a friend of mine, "How many Valentines are enough?" If this county historical society is saving Victorian Valentines, and that county historical society is, and 300 county historical societies in this country have collections of Victorian Valentines, how many do you need to have in order to know what you want to know about Victorian Valentines at some point in the future? It is not just how many or much of the records of the Department of Chemistry you need to have, but how many institutions of higher educations' records have to be saved? Or do you save them in different ways? There is a possibility for thinking and planning; I do not know if you would ever get to the implementation stage, but just thinking about it might open up conceptual and research possibilities.

Best:

One possibility would be to select several types of collection, of institution. At the same time you do have to address the "Valentine question." Select institutions and the types of collection, and then try to get at this epistemology matter in several differing institutions.

Hinding:

That would not be to say that the University of Minnesota, if it were not part of this one network, would not go on having its own university archives for its own purpose. But that there might be a network of institutions that document things in a particular way to meet anticipated and unanticipated needs.

Smith:

If we are going to take into account the fact that all materials are not necessarily lodged in archives, then we have to begin to try to give some structure to the approach, some identification process of where we look and how we look. Of course, we have to recognize different administrative structures and, with refinements, these would apply to a variety of institutions or institutional structures.

Hinding:

We were silly enough to think when we started that we could predict the response, and we were badly burned. That may also be true in this project, no matter how you define or limit its scope. When you start to ask a question such

as that, you may find out all sorts of wonderful items. Another point is that we should try to take steps to be sure that what we find accumulates. One thing to do is to give relevant data to NHPRC. In our project, we shared repository name lists. In addition we want to share what I have started to think of as "authority" lists. We spent months worrying about proper names and names of organizations. We wished we had for primary and for unpublished sources, the type of "authority" files which librarians have for published materials. I understand that now such a dictionary has been published. To be sure, it would have helped us if we had known about it.

Eggert:

One of my students has been involved in railroad history, and apparently the Pennsylvania Railroad has thrown away nothing in its recent upheavals. They have warehouses full of material. However, they do not know what exists. In addition, they do not have willingness to look and they are not even sure who owns it. This creates enormous problems with one of our oldest and foremost corporations, and there exists a danger that most will be thrown away. Various groups have talked about how to save parts of it. The sheer problem of the great mass of materials alone may mean that the collection cannot be kept intact.

Thinking about corporations being proud of their past, I had contact with the Pullman Corporation. They were not necessarily afraid of their past, but rather were unaware of what it contained prior to five years ago. They also did not throw anything away, apparently. It may be that the sheer quantity of materials is greater than we anticipate even for education.

Alterman:

I think that it is part of the duty of the historian to understand that not everything for which he looks is to be found easily. There are peculiar, hard to find settings in which documents exist, such as safes and warehouses. Given this fact, we must ask whether it is enough to have a project to survey university, state and local archives and forget materials that are untapped.

Warren:

I would think that it depends on what you want. It is obvious that there have to be limits, let us call them dimensions. I would hope that the dimensions would cut in different directions. We have the possibility of an analog to the "great man" theory and that would be the "great institution" theory. I would hate to see that happen. One of the things we should try to do to preserve these materials would be to get at the effects of educational activities and programs: These documents would help us do that. To the extent that we can, it would be helpful to locate and identify even some of these proverbial hidden safes, or bottom drawers, or whatever.

There is another critical dimension to consider. If a project of this magnitude comes off, we are, to some extent, setting the parameters of historical research in one area for some time to come. I am not sure I am prepared to take that responsibility, particularly if there is not a critical dimension to the collection. We need to preserve at least enough documents to give us critical distance,

so that at some point someone in the future can look back and do critiques of outcomes and institutions.

Alterman:

I agree that we shall have to limit the design of the project so that it excludes a great many of these hidden sources.

Warren:

Before we set limits, it is clear that the two projects about which we heard collected relevant information for this projected effort. There must be other examples around the country and we ought to find out what has already been collected. That may take time, but from what was said about the women's history project, I would have guessed that there is an immense amount there on higher education alone.

Hinding:

Often there tends to be a sense that there are not enough sources. Historians worried about this when we began and said we would have to go and find the materials because they were scarce or that there would not be enough to do our work. What we found was quite the reverse. I am certain that if you polled the 15,000 repositories, self-conscious repositories, that you would find enough information to write any kind of education history for the rest of your life. You may find that some areas are not represented. We found that ethnic and blue collar women were under-represented, they did not leave as many written records to collect. There were other interesting areas of under-representation. Your problem may be that you have too much. It may be that you have to find out what is there, first, and then consider what should be there in relation to what is there.

Warren:

It may be that to survey the published and the unpublished guides to collections would constitute a stage in this project.

Moore:

My sense is that what we shall find is a dominance by the old established institutions. We would find great gaps in our understanding in the collections and the illumination of what higher education or education generally has been across the country.

Warren:

But identifying those gaps would be a very important first step.

DEVELOPING AN INVENTORY: SOME CONSIDERATIONS

Johnson:

I have three points which I want to address. First, it would be useful to keep in mind that the project is practical, rather than theoretical in its own right. Pre-eminantly it is to assist something that has always been done, namely the process of historical analysis and interpretation, in this case a many layered and very complex phenomenon. In so many instances it is difficult to say what an educational document is, but the point of the task seems to be shared practically speaking by both collectors and interpreters, both the practiced and the neophyte, if you will. There has to be some sort of communication possible such that Professor "X" can positively conclude that he/she will profit by visiting institution "Y" or location "Y", and in some ways it is as simple as that. How complex that can become you have already shown, and I need not further emphasize that.

The second point, it seems to me is a consequence. There have to be some categories which are serviceable and intelligible to both collector and user. What we need to do is to make the task reasonable and practicable; little else matters at this point because to go on from that simply means to define the task.

I have been thinking about this and looking at some of my own rather humble efforts and that was useful, if only to raise some problems. I am going to just take two. How do I attack, for example, the history of a given college or institution which I happen to be interested in studying? In my case, I want to look at alternatives that are open to such institutions such as the choices that seem to stand before them; the reasons that are offered for the decisions that are made. The questions is how could both these and their ongoing effects be manifested in a physical way? I want to know what in a college or university will demonstrate its relationship to its culture in a precise way so that I can draw relatively sane conclusions. For example, what did certain professors teach? What did certain students learn? If that is not all the students, which part is it? What relationship has the part of the students to the whole? Why did these professors teach what they taught in that fashion? How and why did students receive it in a particular manner? What relations can be shown between certain cultural and social sources and areas like curriculum research, faculty, student life, institutional policy, and indeed rhetoric? It seems that what we have gotten into is an historiographical problem and we might as well face this at the outset, because it is to arise wherever we turn.

This project is important especially in this period of great confusion and concern over educational choices which have been made. We have witnessed the expiration of certain choices and we are not clear what to put in their place. In consequence the real history-making is crucial because, if we can borrow William James' phrase, "It is history that thickens our theories, and not to do history makes it possible for every sort of metaphysical disease to corrupt our efforts at forming new choices by critically examining the old ones we have made." The purpose of this little excursus appears to be that we want to save that thickening process which means it is going to be murky, it is going to have different shapes

when we encounter it, and to impose some kind of superorder on it would do violence to our work and make the best work impossible. So I am led to the conclusion that categories are needed. They need some universality, some intelligibility, across methods and principles, yet they can afford to be somewhat eclectic. It might even be permissive, that people, places, be allowed to say what they have because what they say that they have is in itself an important piece of the evidence. That an institution chooses to portray as its sources, or portray itself in terms of certain sources, its past, is in itself of some interest and importance. The tool in this sense is more than merely a tool. It is an example of history in the process of being made by a number of people in a number of different ways. This itself has value.

My third point concerns where we might find principles for the construction of sufficiently broad, yet concrete categories. There seem to be at least three sources in the respective logics in the phenomena which the project joins. First, the logic of the various structures which have been examined at institutions and the fields of education and schooling. There is a conventional analysis which limits, but is a kind of lingua-franca that everybody can understand and understand the variance in, and not be too handicapped. Second, there is the logic of the form of the data in which we are interested. We could build some descriptive categories by simply looking at that. And last, there is the logic of the researchers' task which ought to be kept as free as possible, assuming that this project would go on, have some continuing usefulness, and have some life of its own. I have already noted several flaws in Figure I which the discussion has turned up. I have made an attempt to map some of the problems for discussion. I have drawn a few illustrations from the example, the University of Illinois at Urbana; the University of Chicago; and Georgetown. About research programs, for example, the University of Illinois has a very important collection of documents on plant pathology--the notion that we have to look at plant diseases and their effect on agriculture was brought out by an early president: Burrill. Thus they have a famous collection. The University also has magnificent records on athletics--you can see how homecoming got started. These materials include all kinds of student testimonials, not normally considered to be a rich source for educational history, unless there is some kind of descriptive content. The University also has an interesting collection of railroad engineering documents. Mr. Talbot, the man who invented the transition curve which made the passenger train possible, was a station agent out in the flats of Colorado. So it is not only formal material, it gets down into the ordinary level. The Foster North case at Illinois concerns a student who severely challenged the power of the state to enforce any kind of religious qualification or religious character to university events at least 50-75 years ahead of his time. I used the phrase "stars and glories" because I think that, even though we want to get away from this great leader theory, what a university thinks of as its great stars is a significant event in itself, or what its says from the podium on ceremonial occasions certainly is not the whole historical truth. It is something that we really want to look at in very important ways. A certain amount of prescribed definition, plus a certain amount of self-recording would be useful. Finally, the difference between a book entry, which I can idly leaf through, trying to figure out where I might follow the trial of something, and a set of buttons, codes or whatever to press which would then tell me how to

call up and make more discriminating judgments would be absolutely all-important.

Discussion

Smith:

I think the way in which we should go about this project would be to approach several institutions to see whether it would work, or to see whether other categories emerged, or some had to be collapsed when some experienced individuals got into an actual institution. But it seems that this is an excellent thesis to test.

Herbst:

I saw Walter Schatz' Directory of Afro-American Resources (1970) which listed whatever a given institution had in resources, say faculty minutes, trustee minutes, nothing else. If you visit an institution with this outline of categories, who is going to sit down and break down their trustee resources into more specific points? Can we afford to send people out to do that?

Smith:

We might afford it on a pilot basis, by refining and expanding the structure itself, and then be able to do it on a more or less direct basis. That could be the initial project, to test, modify, retest such an approach, a methodology, or a structure of selected institutions or kinds of institutions. Presumably an inventory of certain kinds of institutions would be useful in itself. Secondly, one would have a more expanded, developed structuring device by which to view the holdings of the institution or kinds of institutions. It would certainly be possible to consider, for example, just the State of Pennsylvania with the different types of institutions that we have.

Alterman:

In a number of ways that may offer a solution to fund this project. They may be more interested to do it in their states. Also, we have talked about universities, but there are also community colleges and business, trade, and technical schools which may have to be addressed.

Smith:

Another item to be addressed is that some of the most interesting and advanced educational procedures are being implemented by corporations. For example, IBM runs an excellent post-doctoral program for its technical people, and it might be of interest to look at those techniques.

Hinding:

While I am interested in this intellectually, I am troubled by it as an archivist. This type of suggestion to me is a research project rather than a survey of archival institutions. I try to imagine how a typical university archivist would respond to this offering of categories, and I think 95 percent of them would decline to respond. I try to think of how a junior college is to do this if there is not an existing archival program.

Smith:

I think we always have to think in terms of a two-dimensional taxonomic structure. What we have here is, essentially, a vertical structure, or subject structure. Within that, of course, you need a form structure that then identifies what the descriptive components are that constitute a record and that constitute useful descriptive information of a single entity.

Johnson:

We need a set of clues that can be used as fashions and interests change. We are doing different things now compared with what historians did ten, twenty, fifty years ago.

USES OF COMPUTERS

Sahli:

Whenever you start discussing computers, you have to consider the type of availability you want your users to have and the kind of accessibility to the information that you have gathered. There are different types of computer access and computer related means of access including on-line systems, sequential files, off-line systems, computer output microfiche, computer driven photo composition, printouts, and visual displays; what you decide to have depends on what you need for your users, and what you can afford. There are no hard and fast rules for deciding on computer systems, except that you really have to ask yourself what you want for a final product. The decision on your final product will certainly influence your choice of computer system, and it should also influence the design, for example, of your survey forms, and the general administrative make-up of your project.

What we have used at NHPRC is Spindex, which is a system recently developed at the National Archives specifically to deal with archival and manuscript materials. It is a sequential file system that has eight hierarchical levels within it. These levels ideally, are intended to relate to a particular hierarchy, let us say, within an institution, such as record group, sub-group, series, box, folder, or item. Spindex is a relatively cheap system for nonprofit users. The purchase price is $1500. It is not, however, an on-line system, and the currently available means of output are limited to line-printer, photo composed copy ready for print, and computer output microfiche. We find, however, that Spindex is an extremely easy system for the average person to use. It operates on IBM 360 and 370 computers which are generally available throughout the country. It does not use any fancy codes since you enter data in English words or numbers. It also has some newly designed features that increase its flexibility over its several predecessors. Some of the institutions who are using Spindex, such as Cornell University, have developed interactive data entry techniques. Generally, however, the system is limited to using punched cards, which are quickly out of date, MIST, or CPT word-processing equipment. There is an additional communicating program being developed now which will increase the capability of the system. Spindex is just one system that is available.

There are many systems and what you have to decide is which system is going to suit your needs. You have to ask yourself about the people who are going to be using the system. Are they going to be historians, or are they going to be computer specialists? If they are historians, you may want a simpler system; if they are computer specialists, a more complex one.

Smith:

There are perhaps three or four major retrieval systems. The simplest system is the sequential system. Such systems are tape-oriented, which means it assumes that the information is to be stored on microfilm or magnetic tape. Unquestionably, storage of information on the magnetic tap is probably the cheapest form of storage of information. It is certainly cheaper than punched cards or 3" by 5" index cards when you consider that you can probably store

many hundreds of millions of characters on a single role of tape, which occupies about as much shelf space as a book. Now the sequential system has certain advantages and disadvantages. Like a reel-to-reel tape recorder, if you want to hear the song on the end of the audio tape, you have to wind the whole thing till you get to that. It takes time, and because time and computers cost money, it is more expensive to do a particular type of search with the exception that your development costs for the software and the development cost or your maintenance costs for adding and maintaining records on a sequential system are much lower than on the more advanced systems.

The second kind to be considered is what is called an "inverted file" system. This system makes possible what is called random access or in some environments, interactive access. This means that instead of organizing your information primarily on tape, which is a sequential medium, you make the assumption that your information is going to be stored on a device that will allow you to jump to the middle or the end or any other place in a random fashion. Now there are several kinds of media that do that, but the most prominent medium is what is called a magnetic disc. A magnetic disc looks like a phonograph record, except that its entire surface is coated with a ferro-magnetic material like a magnetic tape. It spins around and the head is on a moving device. It can read one place, and then it can jump and read somewhere else. It is like cutting your tape up into many pieces and pasting them around in circles so that you can jump to the back of the file as well as into the first of the file. To use such a device, you have to assume that your file has more than one mode of organization.

An inverted file system does not automatically mean that you are free to jump to any record under any taxonomy. You must establish priorities and make decisions about how extensive the inversion is going to be. You have sequential and various levels of inverted file systems. The advantage is, one can quickly go to any single piece of information for which the file has been inverted. For example, I use an inverted file system involving novels and collections of novels to deal with literary analysis. Under that system, I can go immediately to all occurrences of any given word, without having to go through the entire text, by using the directory structure.

A third level of retrieval system is perhaps best illustrated by the **New York Times** information system. If you go to an inverted file system and you have an extremely large data base, then you may wish to structure your response in some type of query mode and respond in some hierarchical fashion. If you are talking about a data base of more than 15-, 20-, 30,000 records and the search strategy calls for too broad a response then it is likely to be cost ineffective. To guard against that, some people go in and report back that the category located 30,000 records, do you really want to see them all? The user could then ask for the secondary, tertiary or next level of categorization and look through that. You are led to refine your search request in a kind of balance between how much and how little you want to see. Obviously, search strategy is really a fine tuning operation and this, of course, is a much more expensive type of system.

Eggert:

Would there not be difficulty in the initial classification of these things, and a need to have a much more detailed analysis of what is in this material?

Smith:

One interesting thing is the catalytic effect that computers have. Because the computer is so dominant, because it is so literal and you have to tell it each thing and you have to find every assumption, it can lead you to think your project through in extreme detail. If you do not think it through with that kind of detail and you make some mistakes, the computer will amplify those mistakes tremendously. That leads to what I would say is a helical approach to developing a structure. We looked at some categories earlier, but I would suspect that with the kind of material, the diversity, the uncertainty regarding the structure of that material, and exactly what the anticipated needs are, you would have to begin with a pilot approach. When you are fairly confident of a structure in terms of the kind of information you are looking at and the kinds that are proposed, then at that stage you design a record format.

You will have to identify components, how they are to be described, and how they are to be entered. Also, you will need a set of categories similar to that dealing with the subjects of the major orientation. In a sense you have a vertical structure of subject, a horizontal structure of components. That horizontal component is extremely important because it identifies by kind a particular class of information. Perhaps the simplest and easiest method is to go to a sequential system, but the important thing is to uniquely identify the components within the records so that if you wish to move to that next step, if the level of usage ever justifies an inverted file system, then you know where to find the elements. If you have designed your records' structure to include provisions for identification of a field, then it should not be difficult to invert the system. Designing your category system carefully, permits the user to lay the foundation for a much more flexible approach further down the line. Regardless of whether it is justified, it is going to greatly simplify your search strategy even within a sequential mode.

Sahli:

We should stress that in contemplating a system, one needs to allow for flexibility. For example, people have learned that you cannot rigidly apply Library of Congress subject heads, and that you have to have something built into your system that will enable you to make changes when they are appropriate. This is one important reason to have your different information categories broken out into discrete fields or tracks. For example, if you had an accretion to the collection, or wanted to change a volume but lacked this provision, you would have to go in and change that entire data tag. You could not just pick out the volume, tag and change that.

The same thing goes for any revision to your system. It is important, when investigating systems, to pay close attention to what the system can do. One Spindex user got into some trouble because they did not read the documentation carefully. They entered their data in the way they thought was best and then found much to their chagrin that it was not in the sequential order intended for

the final product. Likewise, you should carefully evaluate what the output modes are. I would suggest consulting, not only with the computer center, but with people who have used computer systems for humanistic purposes. There is sometimes a gap between the language that computer specialists speak and the language the humanists speak, and for that reason it is good to find someone on a consulting basis who can help to bridge that gap, at least at the beginning when you are trying to set up your system.

Another area of caution is that of system maintenance. Once you purchase one of the available programs, Spindex or Selgem or something like that, it is important that you have a contact person who can make program modifications for you, who can write new programming language if you should need that. It is also important that the program be documented; have some sort of written explanation of what the program can do. Have good documentation of the processes that you follow on a day-to-day basis; where your tapes are, where your data is coming from, where it is going. It is an administrative skill to keep a computer project going. You should bear in mind that it is dangerous to carry things around in your head. For example, if I were to leave my project next week, I would not want to take everything with me. Everything should be written down so that my successors can pick up fairly readily and know what it is that we are about.

I would also pay careful attention to costs. It is one thing to purchase a system for $1500 and have to spend, let us say, $5000 to modify it to get what you want. It is another thing to spend $50,000 to get what you want. The cheapest system may not be the best system, but do take cost into account. You also need to consider that data entry costs with an interactive system are higher than with an off-line system, because it is literally hooked up to a computer and it is quite costly to use computer time.

There are wide variations among computer centers, the kind of service that they will offer, and the cost of that service. Another point to consider is that some computer photo-composition companies are changing or going out of business. When talking about computerization, remember that it is not necessary to go the whole way at the beginning. You may consider on-line capability later as opposed to off-line entry at the beginning. By designing your total system well, you make the transition much easier. Caution and good planning are keys to success in this area. Do not rush into something that somebody tries to sell you. Even before that, however, it is important to plan to obtain and record your data in a uniform way so that when the time comes to enter it into a system it can be readily transferred.

Discussion

Hinding:

There are a couple of problems. First, is the need to strike a balance at some point between doing it only once, or doing it annually or bi-annually so that there may be justification, depending on sale or the use of the thing, for doing it every five to ten years. Where do you set your break-even point?

The second, is that at some point there could be several national operations engaged in a survey of archives and manuscripts and this effort would produce a possible duplication of effort and that may be counterproductive. I do not know enough about computer technology to say whether or not this could happen. My view of computers is that we always get to them before we know what it is we want to do. I see them as means to ends. The end is to have it in the computer, and something that you have in the computer is all right, without knowing whether the use justifies the cost.

Sahli:

This is why it is important to ask how long the project is going to last, the kind of different outputs you want, even the time frame of your user access. We do not envision archivists and historians needing information overnight when they are doing research in the same way that medical people might need instant access to current medical literature in order to read something and save a person's life.

Alterman:

There is a variable here, though, that is not often in our control. It is the fact that there are certain policies at the funder's level which indicate that your chances will be enhanced if you can computerize en route. I know we ran into this when preparing other proposals. Fundability may force us to go to computers.

Smith:

Let me respond to both comments in two respects if I can. I would like to go back to the phrase I used earlier, the "catalytic" effect of computers. Dr. Hinding's point that computers are means to an end is certainly true, but it is probable that the computer expands the ends that are possible. For example, I was interested that the Women's History publication had 1700 pages followed by 900 pages of index. The capabilities that we are talking about allow one to think of an index as essentially a retrieval system where several items are pulled together under several, almost unlimited, alterative arrangements.

The second point goes back to what Dr. Alterman said. NEH has now had a significant degree of experience with computer related projects. The research tools division deals annually with between sixty and one hundred proposals which involve a computer. They fund probably one-half to one-third of those, so over the past four to five years they have funded and had experience with perhaps, one hundred different projects that have used computers. It is not just a whim of NEH to encourage people to use computers. What they are saying is that for a sizeable project that involves indexing, concordance construction, perhaps even textual editing, it is simply more cost effective to purchase computer services or computer hardware than to use some of these existing systems. NEH, for example, is extremely wary of funding software development. They will fund software modifications; to take an existing system and spend $5,-6,000 modifying it to suit your needs would be regarded as perfectly reasonable. They would not fund $20,000 to develop an indexing system, because NEH is sophisticated enough to know there are already numerous systems around. Their interest in

computerization is not so much a matter of policy but rather a matter of balancing budgets. They have demonstrated on numerous occasions that it is simply more cost effective to use computers in certain, but not all, applications. From what I understand of this project, it probably would be cost effective, and probably impossible to deal with in any other way than through computerization.

Sahli:

Arbitrarily saying to people that they have to use a computer is rather heavy-handed. A better approach would be to suggest it to the applicant and make them justify not using it; when you get into a 50/50 situation it may be better to choose not to use it.

WEST GERMAN PROJECT: AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Heinemann:

Our research work started in 1973 with the documentation of current programs and projects. Initially, we received replies to our questionnaires from 150 projects. These replies were printed and sent out to the respondents so that they could be aware of what our efforts were producing and of the research works of others in the field. Our research documentation is continuing with our newsletter and with a new survey being undertaken every three years. The last survey, 1976-77, contained more than 400 projects. From the replies, we are getting a sense of what is going on in our society and in our discipline, what the problems are, which approaches are used, and what inferences can be drawn.

One of the benefits arising from this work has been in the planning of conferences and determining which theme would draw together which people. We have started with two conferences a year, one on methodology and one on a special theme. Out of these conferences our society is producing, at two volumes per year, a series of current publications.

A further step was to document new publications. This has been done by my entering into the data bank some 1000 to 1500 articles and monographs which appear annually on the history of education in the German language area. This includes Austria and Switzerland. We have no close contacts with the German Democratic Republic, but have received a surprising number of monographs which had not previously come to light, such as dissertations and small publications from teachers and from schools, a history of school in a town. Our initial efforts to get archives to say how they could help us was something of a failure. They raised questions about their policy regarding holdings and this brought responses questioning my policy for the questionnaire. The situation at present is that the archives furnish information only if they wish to do so.

Even at the outset, when considering the use of a computer, one of the primary factors was to minimize the loss in printing costs. Basically, I look upon a computer as an "intelligent typewriter" and an intelligent means of handling data. The computer could also be a system to which could be added a photo-compositing machine. With this addition, the final text of a document, even after being typed and corrected as a "manuscript" into the computer, could be prepared for the printer without it having to be re-typed from a print-out of a copy. My publishers in Germany see this as a positive way to cut costs, particularly on publications with limited sales potential. We found a system which can combine just these features.

No matter which system we use, though, we need to establish a set of descriptors which will be appropriate to both published and unpublished materials and which would go beyond simply the title of the work. The main thing may be the region and the period about which the article is written. For example, if the work deals with events in the period 1392 to 1521, then this information is fed into the computer, together with details regarding the region, the state, the province or a capital city. Obviously, other descriptors could be added to provide

more particular data potential, for exampie, on higher education or primary education, to avoid becoming lost in the gestalt of all matters educational. However, the application of descriptors is a special job for specialists, a job perhaps best done by the faculty.

In addition to gathering information of and from published and unpublished materials, we are building up the statistical data base making use of information dating back to the beginning of the 19th century.

The issue of being off-line or on-line probably does not arise if you own the computer. In our case there is no need for an on-line service. Of the approximately 260 members in our association only about 10 per cent are willing to go into research. The others are interested in what we produce. When a colleague asks me to search with the computer, I do it happily and send them the results. This has been very helpful to me, in fact, because I have learned so much about documentation systems, and have faced questions that otherwise I would not have met. When entering information, it takes me only 4 days to cover 1500 titles, typing the data into the computer.

The cost of the total system is probably about $100,000 and it would cost about 7-8 per cent of this amount a year to maintain it. However, if the publisher is benefitting from your photo-processing systems, and is paying for them, then your maintenance costs could be covered. In Germany, research foundations would be prepared to finance such short-term research projects as this. Anything longer than about four years, they say, is the responsibility of the university, of the state. All our costs were covered and I started. I am also very optimistic, with 29 years to work and an established chair(!).

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Eggert:

Is there any on-going attempt to have a directory of what is in all archives? It would seem to be an endless duplication if each of us is going out and surveying an area as Dr. Hinding has done for women, would it be better to concentrate on one general index?

Sahli:

This is what we are doing. This is one reason the NHPRC will not fund some general surveys related to materials in repositories.

Eggert:

How long would it be before you could develop what we are talking about from your inventory?

Sahli:

At the present rate of funding for the NHPRC, and funding of surveys, I would say twenty-five to thirty years. We have statewide surveys going now in New York, Kentucky and Washington, and partial surveys in the midwest and Delaware. We have some other subject surveys sharing information with us.

Eggert:

We seem to be talking about one of the largest imaginable projects. To bring out a single volume once, appears to be an enormous waste. It would become so dated. I think, for example, of Philip Hamer's work that current historian's use. It was published in 1961 and the information gathering stopped in 1957. This seems to be an enormous waste.

Sahli:

Also, if we do a comprehensive history of education we are talking in terms of many thousands of pages.

Hinding:

My point earlier concerned the distinction between administrative and intellectual control. We may have the resources to do administrative controls of all the collections in this country, which probably exceed two million. You can get basic data and elementary descriptions of the contents of a collection and you have advanced administrative control.

There is a difference between published and unpublished sources. Published sources represent condensed and synthesized information, tables of contents, indexes, and they lend themselves to narrow descriptors, to a minimum number of interpretations and re-interpretations. Unpublished or primary sources lend themselves to constant and continual re-interpretation. One of the collections that has been described for women's history sources survey is the records of Survey Associates which published a survey magazine from 1909 to 1952--**Social Welfare Journal.** When that collection was reported to the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections, it was described in one way. When it was

reported for the Women's History Sources Survey, it was possible to emphasize all the women which we could not afford to c... in the space NUCMC allowed us. If it were described for Edu...on History Sc...ces Survey, it would be described in yet another way. A national program of control, I think, is very useful and I would like to see it happen. I do not think that precludes the need for special subjects surveys.

Sahli:

There is a big difference between administrative and intellectual control, and I think that about a year from now we are going to evaluate the participants of the NHPRC, of other people, and simply decide is it feasible to continue with something like this. It costs a tremendous amount of money. We are talking in terms of say $500,000 to $1 million per state to do a comprehensive survey.

Hinding:

Further, once you have done a comprehensive survey the categories and concepts may change. We did not have a war on poverty when collections were arranged and described in the 1940's and 1950's. The conceptual framework changes so that the archivist always needs to be able to reevaluate or re-interpret their holdings so that in some sense you can finish with administrative control. You can ask for a brief description of the person's personal papers or the organization's records, but you will never be done with education history sources, or women's history or any given collection. That is a characteristic about unsynthesized and unprocessed information, it is constantly subject to re-interpretation.

Eggert:

What you are saying is what we already know in history, that you can go over the same material a thousand different ways. What we are talking about is a never ending task. The question is, do we plunge in?, and what particular value are we going to get out of this plunge? I am beginning to have some very serious researvations.

It occurs to me that a most important idea to emerge from the discussion touched on the untapped sources and to get new material that in general the public people does not know about. That would be a very difficult task, and a very expensive one as compared to simply taking the holdings of known repositories and recording what is in them.

Filippelli:

Historical research has changed so much very recently, it presents a number of different problems. Traditionally, for doing research in 19th and 18th century material, and particularly political history, Hamer was extremely useful. It is name oriented, but that is the way of research. If one was to work on a particular politician or a particular administration, one could identify names, go to Hamer and find out which of those people had deposited papers and which had been reported to Hamer, a relatively small group in many ways, and then locate them. If, for example, you could identify that the papers of Richard Olney did reside somehwere, you could go to the papers and do your work. That is not true of the Survey Associates, though. That kind of corporate heading does not really tell

you anything about the kinds of records that one might find in the papers. It is enormously complicated in terms of access.

Alterman:

These are new times, and we need to develop new ways. Perhaps this document or this project could be illustrative of a new way to try to get at the 19th and 20th century materials and still allow the historian to use his imagination, to be the detective that he is supposed to be.

Smith:

One technical point is that, while you would try to make your taxonomy, your category system, as flexible and as broad as possible you have to recognize that a lot of materials are not going to be accurately expressed by the category system. You are going to need a more sophisticated retrieval routine that can retrieve not just a category, but also a complete content of a category. Instead of saying "give me everything dealing with music curriculum" you could go in and look within the field of music curriculum and designate specific words and specific content and retrieve that.

Secondly one of the things the project will need to address from the beginning is a kind of "end-up" oriented consideration. That is if the project is funded, either for an initial pilot stage or for a second developmental stage, can the project be maintained, in the expanding stage, the period of collection of data, or simply at the level of service that it anticipates, beyond any further federal funding?

In this respect, you could consider that one way to generate resources would be to sell its services, to sell custom retrievals, to sell continuing indices of one sort or another. That raises another consideration, though, about the potential user market for this resource. Are we talking about 500, 5,000 or 50,000 people in the United States wanting to use this. An estimate or projection of intended use is needed and you have to be able to use that number for generating some type of financial structure. One possibility could be essentially what the social scientists have done in the Ann Arbor Consortium; offer institutions a service and ask them to subscribe maybe $100 a year. I think the continuing financial structure is a factor to consider when planning this project.

Eggert:

How many historians of education are actively involved in research in the whole United States?

Mattingly:

There are 700 individual members of the History of Education Society who are active, there are 1,300 to 1,400 institutions, and we usually figure two to three users per institution. We are picking up personages in history departments where people used to teach business without education or labor without education. Many historians are now figuring that education has dimension to it and are making their peace with it.

You have to have this notion of service center. Dr. Heinemann can talk about that because that is much more the precedent and practice in Germany than it is in this country. That involves not just the centennial stuff, but includes associations for private colleges and universities. There are others that I think a percentage of that membership would be very much interested.

Best:

I had speculated that this project might lead into the publishing of a series of pamphlets listing, perhaps two or three units depending on the interests of subscribers. In other words, set up a subscription rate and come up with a product, and continue revising it, of course.

Sahli:

I think it is important that the users have access to the whole system, too.

Mattingly:

So, we should have a notion of priorities. In higher education planning, the major preoccupation of everybody now is the students--who is going to school, and your student profiles. That is why I was stressing earlier that correlation, at least for this project, between the archivist and the alumni association to develop those student profiles would be useful.

Flexner:

The only thing I would add to that would be the financing of higher education.

Filippelli:

Is it appropriate at this point to raise an issue about the direction we are taking? It seems to me it has been accepted here that we are talking about higher education? Is this correct?

Best:

Yes, it would seem so.

Filippelli:

Perhaps elementary and secondary education would be more significant if we can only do part of education. It seems to me that, in the present funding climate, we are more likely to get money to do elementary and secondary than we are to do higher education. NEH appears to be making an effort now to fund programs which deal with minorities, with working class topics, women, et cetera. In higher education, we are talking about incredibly diverse small private colleges, large private universities, state universities, state teachers colleges, community colleges, a range in which you deal with public, private, church-related, and other institutions. In elementary and secondary education, however, we deal in public education and therefore with recognizeable units easy to identify. Philosophically, we ought to think about where the money would be best spent. There might be practical considerations to change the focus from higher education.

Eggert:

It would certainly increase the size of the data bank.

Mattingly:

It would be overwhelming. Also I would challenge your notion that higher education is really the history of elites. That is certainly not true, precisely for the variability of the institutions enumerated, the religious institutions. Many of the postsecondary institutions are strongly region-oriented. Student populations at places like Amherst or Dartmouth could be hill-country people down on their luck without easy economic backing which would allow them to go to the coastal colleges. They may not be the impoverished lower echelons, but they certainly are in no way comparable to the kinds of populations that are going to other kinds of institutions.

Eggert:

You are still dealing with only about one percent of the population.

Mattingly:

If that is an elite, there were also elites going to public schools in the 19th century; perhaps it is a broader elite but not everybody went to school in the 19th century. We do not even have the clear categories of elementary and secondary education until the 1870s and '80s.

Sahli:

As opposed to higher education, you are talking about a survey going to different types of institutions. You are not going to have the colleges and universities. You will have the state archives for the records of the state boards of education. You will overwhelmingly have local historical societies, scattered school records, and in a few isolated cases, city archives such as the one in Philadelphia, but it is going to be a very different type of project.

Herbst:

This raises again the problem of provenance versus classification. For example, you take New York in the 18th or early 19th century and talk about an equivalent of a state board, which happened to be for higher and secondary education because there were not any primary state organizations. So if you go by provenance you really do not ask the question whether to classify it by higher, et cetera.

Hinding:

It is one thing to aspire to either administrative or intellectual control, and to look to primary sources that affect all or some part of education or schooling. Then you have one whole set of search strategies and problems. If you reject the notion of a data bank then you are slicing the information pie another way. Is it intended to identify primary sources for historical research; is it intended to allow us to project enrollment data and financing of higher education? I am now at sea about what the project is.

Best:

We needed to have this talk around computers, and the earlier discussion which was highly speculative to raise these questions. A pilot effort has been suggested and we did settle on the college questions. As a matter of fact, we thought schools and schooling would be such a vast area that the initial effort might well be with this higher education focus. I realize that the 19th century normal schools fall somewhere in between, but higher education seems to define a little better and we could select certain institutions. We could look upon this project as a long-term effort and eventually include the schools and schooling and the non-formal education aspects of society, but that could take some years.

The suggestion was that we might begin with six or seven institutions here in Pennsylvania. Penn State could be one of these, and a state college, a big one, perhaps Shippensburg; maybe a couple of different private colleges, one with a heavy religious emphasis and Juniata, for example. Also, we could select one of the foundations such as the Mellon Foundation in Pittsburgh because of their interests and involvement in higher education and an existing archive such as the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia. In other words, we could arbitrarily select certain types of institutions that have a higher education focus. Then we should address questions about what we are going to do, what we could expect to come up with, what we might expect to do with it, how difficult and how costly that would be. In other words, perhaps a year from now we would have some answers to what could be done nationally out of a pilot effort of this sort.

Smith:

To return to an earlier point, though, there has to be some initial assumption made as to what is the intent and focus of the effort. If the project was defined as an index to archives or an index of materials pertaining to higher education, that decision has to be justified. Is that what the project is about? Is that what is desired; is that what is needed; can that end be justified? If that is the case, then what you want to do is design the structure of the project. As I hear us, we have probably been talking about a three-stage project: going through some type of initial pilot stage, where we develop the methods, the techniques, create or accumulate data that hopefully would be useful in and of itself, but would come to a tangible conclusion. If funding can be obtained to expand that effort on a national scale, go into a second developmental stage. Seek probably much broader funding, to develop that national resource. And third, move to that self-sustaining stage that we were talking about earlier.

I think that any planning and any discussion of that has to be focused around what is needed and what this group wants to do. It is a fundamental question whether what is needed is an index to higher education materials or whether what is needed is an index to secondary education materials or primary or secondary or whatever.

Talking about alternate funding sources, I cannot imagine NEH, for example, funding anything of this sort dealing with primary and secondary education. I think you will need to talk about NIE and OE and places like that

because of the university orientation that comes in, particularly the research dimension of higher education.

Best:

Funding is always a consideration, but perhaps the central point is to determine a more manageable area in which to begin work.

Herbst:

It occurs to me that if we limit it to higher education, that first stage will not reveal problems until we finally go to associations of primary and secondary education. That is why I am skeptical of limiting it to a subject area. I think it might be a good idea to limit it geographically as an experiment, but not to a particular area.

Eggert:

Would stage one, then, give us something if stage two and three never took off? Stage one at least could serve as a model and guide people to another stage or another facet; in other words, stage one would not be worthless.

Best:

I would presume that this initial stage would have some use in Pennsylvania and that it would have some value in itself.

Sahli:

There could be a lot of interest in, say, a project in Pennsylvania that might yield models for collection development. Within the profession, there is a lot of interest in college and university archive standards, and a project like this could have a great impact on the colleges and universities themselves.

I would say that for funding from us it would be mandatory that some sort of an evaluative report and study came out in addition to just the survey itself. I would also suggest that, while you are planning for this, you might talk with some of the colleges and universities whose archival development projects we have funded in the last couple of years. The three that come most readily to mind are Yale, Johns Hopkins Medical School, and Tusculum College in Tennessee. They are three very different types of institutions with different problems, and yet they represent three of the types that you are going to find as you go out into the field. The more armor you have from the beginning, the better. The key that we look for is that there is a problem there that has to be solved.

NEH generally steers clear of public records and projects whereas that is one of the things in which NHPRC is primarily interested, as well as traditional archives and manuscripts. Our chief problem is funding and funding levels. Our average grant is in the neighborhood of $20,-25,000. Generally the commission does not like to fund for longer than one year. If you are interested in larger amounts of money, then NEH or OE might be good places to go.

Smith:

Would they consider funding, for example, a year that would be a "pre-

pilot" project which might be focused on an initial organizational design that might say, catalog Penn State and which would then lead to or be used as a basis for an application for a statewide pilot effort that presumably would lead into something bigger? I do not think you could begin to do a state for $20,-25,000, yet I think there is a large amount of groundwork that needs to be done just to plan that particular approach.

Sahli:

It depends upon how you are going to limit your universe within the state. You have to deal with the question of whether you are going to survey active records as well as those in the archives. If you are only doing things in the archives you could do it fairly cheaply, because there is not much there. To survey all of the active records, however, would be much more expensive.

Filippelli:

The kind of project that would make sense would be one funded so that the archivist could go throughout the institution and identify all the records actually there, move in and process them to a certain level. That would make sense. The Johns Hopkins project, for instance, was of this nature.

The problem you would run into, at an institution like Penn State, could be getting some kind of a commitment on the part of the university administration that they would in fact eventually fund a university archive. I think you should do this at an institution where they see the value of the project and would guarantee funding and interest.

Sahli:

It seems to be much easier for institutions trying to develop comprehensive archival records' management systems to get a commitment from the administration before they even go into an initial project phase. This is true of the museums that were starting to fund archival programs. I believe that is the way Yale did it. You get the committment from the top which blocks them in over the long run. Then you go out and try to get soft money to start it off, hopefully with the assurance that you could prove then to the trustees and the president that this program works.

One thing in which the commission would be interested is the actual administrative control of the materials and questions in areas such as their physical condition, preservation. If you are talking about using this survey not just for guides and things, but also as a tool to get college and university administrations to do something more about their records, the physical needs of the materials are very important.

Mattingly:

One of the things we did at NYU when trying to decide what was historical and what was a record, was to set a cut-off date of 1930. It was very conservative at the outset, none of the existing administrators were there then. Their files do not go back that far, and they do not know where the records are for the period up to 1930. Then we found a date, shortly after World War II, about which the

administrators began to get nervous. The intimation was that after that the retrieval of records would not be too hard and in the basic categories that we have talked around. I think if you set an arbitrary date, something like 1930, you would get a sense of how the administrators will react to later material, and it would give you a comparison data for all of the archives at which you look.

Best:

Can we assume that we are talking about some sort of model, planning project in stages? I was rather taken by the point that if we limit the project to higher education in this planning model we would not get at the real issues. We would not have gotten at the thorny question of schools and schooling. My inclination is to limit the number considered, but to include certain examples of schools as well as colleges, perhaps to stray into non-formal education, into labor education or one of those areas, to see what all the problems are.

Warren:

The more we talk about this the more impossible it appears to become! There has been a large amount of work done already. The field itself has achieved a level of sophistication and maturity such that now is a good time to do this kind of project. Furthermore, it is feasible whereas ten years ago it would not have been feasible because not enough research had been done. A lot of hands-on, on-site digging has been done. I think it is important that this project not try to duplicate that effort. It might be more than consulting the various published and unpublished guides that have already been done or are in process. There is also an enormous amount of monograph literature, the bibliographic essays of which, the footnotes of which, give us a quantity of information that ought to be assimilated before we ever launch a pilot project, before we ever set foot out in the field. That is an important stage to include to make sure that we know where we are going.

I have a slight problem with the pilot project that has been identified and it has to do with the sort of vertical categories that have been identified. They are vertical in the institutional mode; higher education institutions, schools--elementary and high schools, non-formal institutions. My problem with that is that those vertical modes could possibly miss the horizontal modes, particularly in this country in the 19th century because those bureaucratic policy-imposing structures were largely invisible. My field is federal education policy and everyone knows that there was none in the 19th century, but there was federal education activity. It affected people in those institutions. If all we do is look vertically at the institutions as though they were the only significant actors, we might miss some of these, somewhat invisible, complex, rather diffuse influences that cut across institutions. Even great men and great women are not going to fit neatly into higher education, elementary, secondary, non-formal categories. If we are not going to be provincial, we need to include things like institutions for Native Americans and non-institutional educational forms among immigrant groups, that is, not simple non-formal institutions. These are complexities that I would like to see at least represented symbolically in the pilot project about which we are talking.

What is the need for this and what use is going to be made of it? Even in the pilot project, as we all know, the kind of questions that we ask are going to shape the stuff we collect. It we have not done some thinking about the questions we are going to ask, we could very well miss the most valuable materials.

Best:

It has been important for us to survey the scene, to get to know some of the questions that may be raised in designing any sort of plan, quite apart from asking for financial support for a project of this sort. My inclination is to see all of this discussion as important raw material out of which we might be able to make some sensible, reasonable design. We still need to work on the matter of categories and the question of the search strategies. Another point we raised was the form which an entry would take. Initially, though, it appears to be appropriate to consider some kind of planning project or model in which we would limit ourselves to select colleges, say respositories in five colleges and universities in Pennsylvania. Perhaps two or three examples of differing types of county school systems would be satisfactory. A third area of respository are noninstitutional such as textbook publishers, the labor archives, or the archives of some philanthropic foundation like Carnegie or Mellon in Pittsburgh. I see a project in which we would come up with an exploration of the problems to develop the survey, using these several different examples.

Smith:

The project that you suggest I would estimate, is at least two orders of magnitude greater than the project that we were talking about initially. I can see several stages to a project that tries to deal systematically with materials which pertain to higher education. However, to take on essentially all of education, seems to be an overwhelming project.

I say this because I can see the need to have very different procedures, very different structures, separate taxonomies, for the different types of institution even if you limit the total number of institutions you include. Assuming that you are going to handle this in components, I wonder about the strategy of beginning with higher education as a component. It is certainly an extremely ambitious component which would have to be broken into three or possibly four stages. You could build out from higher education into secondary, into elementary, into institutional, into non-institutional education, rather than beginning with the spread.

Herbst:

I am wondering whether we are using interchangeably the notion of taxonomy and classification. What I have in mind is this: the bigger the system you have, the more general and the less detailed your classification would be. Do you really need the taxonomy? When I look at the **American Historical Review** and the **Journal of American History** under the headings in the rear of accessions due archives, I find reference to 24 boxes from Senator So-and-So, covering this period since he was senator. We know generally what area of the country that corresponds to, what Dr. Heinemann was talking about, the classification by area and by time. Four different historians, interested in the Senate or whatever,

will each find different things from these same boxes. Are we trying to out think these 4 or 400 or 4,000 working historians who are later going to use this material? This is why I am skeptical about your concern for taxonomy. Do we really have to worry about that?

Smith:

My concern with taxonomy is to try to cover potential materials in some systematic fashion. I think that the problem is extremely complex, even within a limited domain like higher education. You know that archives have collections of materials, but we also know that maybe 40 or 50 other offices around university or colleges or foundations might also have information that is of interest. As complex as that problem is, I would be concerned about taking an extremely wide approach. If I were trying to organize a project, I would prefer to begin with some coherent group and then build from that center out, rather than begin with a total thing and build up. But that may be a limitation in my own imagination.

Warren:

An important step in this discussion would be to involve a wider range of historians, particularly historians of education, in the planning and conceptualizing of the pilot project itself. That conceivably could be done at a national meeting. I do not know how or in what kind of format, but there could be some kind of workshop, or discussion session, or something that would involve, particularly, these historians who have been working in higher education history, which I think is an important area. You can count almost on one hand the people who have really done the recent major work in that area, and it might be that they would have a lot of good advice.

There are some things in the pilot project I should like to see tested. For example, to what extent could we minimize the necessity for on-site visits in developing this index? Secondly, without proliferating the project beyond the bounds of imagination, can we extend the pilot project beyond institutionalized collections? I am not interested in expanding it beyond higher education, but to somehow get beyond the materials that have already been institutionalized. I would like to see at least those two points tested in the pilot project.

Moore:

We have a technology now that will handle the kind of scholarly material that those of us in history work with, a technology which can become our tool as well as the technician's tool. Once you build this file, you can add to it and make it accessible. It would be valuable at each stage, but also in the whole.

This issue might be getting people to value it and to invest in it early. One thing we have not talked about is how to assess the value of knowing about the archives in higher education, and the need to make that a useful past to others who are willing to invest in it and who are not only higher education people, narrowly speaking. It may be that some foundations, who have been major forces in the shaping of higher education, might be encouraged to think about higher education over time and the possibility of assessing it through this kind of inventory. I think we will find that the project has merit.

SYMPOSIUM REVIEW

From the outset I have thought that this conference and indeed every aspect of work toward the projected national inventory must have value in and of itself. That is, each piece of work must 'stand on its own," to be judged as to quality of thinking and contribution to scholarly study in the field. In my judgement this Symposium, these two days of meetings, has been an excellent time for developing new connections, new insights in the interaction of history and archives and education. The value of the Symposium, on its own, will be clear I think in the record of these meetings.

A more specific intent of these meetings was to explore needs and interests as well as feasibility of the prcjected national inventory. My hope was that by bringing together this group of us representing differing interests and backgrounds, archivists, historians, educational theorists and historians, and that by opening a free ranging discussion with time enough to pursue whatever interests might develop, we could bring some considerable clarity to the issues. And we have succeeded, I think, remarkably, with few stones worth mentioning left unturned. The need and value to scholarship in the field of such an inventory seems clearly enough established. The problems of organization and the "doing" of it are mountainous of course, not to mention the funding, but some promising directions for approaching these problems have emerged. It is clear that we need to start small, to get at the problems in a pilot effort and to create certain models for proceeding. And where better to begin than in Pennsylvania with all the diversity of people and institutions that we might encounter nationally here close at hand. Through this small beginning we could attempt to solve the large problems of the national project. It seems clear further that the inventory should not limit itself only to schools, or only to higher education, but should encompass from the start a broadly conceived definition of education in American Society.

Finally, I must say that each of you have contributed importantly in exploring these issues during the two days of meetings. On behalf of the College of Education and the University be assured that your work here is very much appreciated. And I would add my personal appreciation along with my colleague Richard Alterman for your interest and your participation. We have the basis now to make a beginning to the project, and for that we are indebted to you and the work of this Symposium.